



# UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE  
United States Patent and Trademark Office  
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS  
P.O. Box 1450  
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450  
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/572,725	03/21/2006	Seon Ho Han	CU-4700 WWP	6890

26530 7590 11/25/2008  
LADAS & PARRY LLP  
224 SOUTH MICHIGAN AVENUE  
SUITE 1600  
CHICAGO, IL 60604

EXAMINER
----------

HSIEH, PING Y

ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
----------	--------------

2618

MAIL DATE	DELIVERY MODE
-----------	---------------

11/25/2008

PAPER

**Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.**

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

<b>Office Action Summary</b>	<b>Application No.</b> 10/572,725	<b>Applicant(s)</b> HAN ET AL.	
	<b>Examiner</b> PING Y. HSIEH	<b>Art Unit</b> 2618	

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

**Period for Reply**

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

**Status**

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 05 September 2008.
- 2a) ☐ This action is **FINAL**.                      2b) ☒ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

**Disposition of Claims**

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-20 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1-20 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

**Application Papers**

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☒ The drawing(s) filed on 21 March 2006 is/are: a) ☒ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.  
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).  
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

**Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119**

- 12) ☒ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☒ All    b) ☐ Some \*    c) ☐ None of:
1. ☒ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. \_\_\_\_\_.
3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

\* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

**Attachment(s)**

- |  |   |
|--|---|
| 1) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)          | 4) <input type="checkbox"/> Interview Summary (PTO-413)           |
| 2) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) | Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____                                      |
| 3) <input type="checkbox"/> Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08)          | 5) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Informal Patent Application |
| Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____  | 6) <input type="checkbox"/> Other: _____                          |

## **DETAILED ACTION**

### ***Continued Examination Under 37 CFR 1.114***

1. A request for continued examination under 37 CFR 1.114, including the fee set forth in 37 CFR 1.17(e), was filed in this application after final rejection. Since this application is eligible for continued examination under 37 CFR 1.114, and the fee set forth in 37 CFR 1.17(e) has been timely paid, the finality of the previous Office action has been withdrawn pursuant to 37 CFR 1.114. Applicant's submission filed on 9/5/08 has been entered.

### ***Response to Amendment***

2. In view of the amendment filed on 9/5/08, the rejection under 35 U.S.C. 112 to claim 20 is withdrawn.

### ***Double Patenting***

3. The nonstatutory double patenting rejection is based on a judicially created doctrine grounded in public policy (a policy reflected in the statute) so as to prevent the unjustified or improper timewise extension of the "right to exclude" granted by a patent and to prevent possible harassment by multiple assignees. A nonstatutory obviousness-type double patenting rejection is appropriate where the conflicting claims are not identical, but at least one examined application claim is not patentably distinct from the reference claim(s) because the examined application claim is either anticipated by, or would have been obvious over, the reference claim(s). See, e.g., *In re Berg*, 140 F.3d 1428, 46 USPQ2d 1226 (Fed. Cir. 1998); *In re Goodman*, 11 F.3d 1046, 29 USPQ2d 2010 (Fed. Cir. 1993); *In re Longi*, 759 F.2d 887, 225 USPQ 645 (Fed. Cir. 1985); *In re Van Ornum*, 686 F.2d 937, 214 USPQ 761 (CCPA 1982); *In re Vogel*, 422 F.2d 438, 164 USPQ 619 (CCPA 1970); and *In re Thorington*, 418 F.2d 528, 163 USPQ 644 (CCPA 1969).

A timely filed terminal disclaimer in compliance with 37 CFR 1.321(c) or 1.321(d) may be used to overcome an actual or provisional rejection based on a nonstatutory double patenting ground provided the conflicting application or patent either is shown to be commonly owned with this application, or claims an invention made as a result of activities undertaken within the scope of a joint research agreement.

Effective January 1, 1994, a registered attorney or agent of record may sign a terminal disclaimer. A terminal disclaimer signed by the assignee must fully comply with 37 CFR 3.73(b).

4. Claim 20 is rejected on the ground of nonstatutory obviousness-type double patenting as being unpatentable over claim 12 of U.S. Patent No. 7,432,768. Although the conflicting claims are not identical, they are not patentably distinct from each other because the conflicting claim discloses a phase frequency detector for receiving a reference frequency  $f_{REF}$  **(a phase frequency detector compares frequency and phase of a predetermined input signal with those of an output signal of the first divider, and outputs a signal for controlling the current pump according to the result)**; a current pump operatively coupled to the phase frequency detector **(a current pump supplies any one of a positive current and a negative current to the low pass filter depending on the output signal of the phase frequency detector)**; a low pass filter operatively coupled to the current pump **(a low pass filter receives an output current of the current pump, and outputs a voltage inputted to an analog input end of the oscillator)**; a digital tuner in parallel to the low pass filter and operatively coupled to the current pump **(a digital tuner intermittently compares the voltage inputted to the analog input end of the oscillator with first and second threshold voltages, and changes a digital value inputted to a digital input end of the oscillator according to the result)**; the oscillator operatively coupled to the LPF and to the DT, wherein the oscillator is a digital analog tuning voltage controlled oscillator for providing the output resonant frequency,  $f_{LO}$  **(the oscillator changes and outputs a frequency of the output signal, depending on the changes of the**

**voltage inputted to the analog input end and the digital value inputted to the digital input end); an N divider operatively coupled to the DAT-VCO and to the PFD (the first N-divider outputs a signal having the frequency of the output signal of the oscillator divided by a first integer).** Although the conflicting claim does not specifically disclose a digital control voltage signal output is located between the DT and the DAT-VCO an analog control voltage signal output is located between the LPF and the DAT-VCO; and the frequency synthesizer is operable in a RF front-end transceiver as disclosed in claim 1 of the present application. It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skills in the art at the time of invention to modify the frequency synthesizer to be included in an RF front-end transceiver; it would also have been obvious to one of ordinary skills in the art at the time of invention to modify the digital control voltage signal output to be located between the DT and the DAT-VCO; and the analog control voltage signal output to be located between the LPF and the DAT-VCO since the location of the digital or analog control voltage signal output is a design choice and does not have to be identical.

### ***Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103***

5. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

6. Claims 1-15 and 17-19 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Hongo et al. (U.S. PATENT NO. 7,089,032) in view of Oono et al. (U.S. PATENT NO. 7,085,587) and further in view of Kim et al. (U.S. PG-PUB NO. 2004/0048591).

-Regarding claims 1, 3, 8 and 13, Hongo et al. disclose an RF front-end transceiver **(as disclosed in fig. 2)** comprising: an oscillator for outputting a resonant frequency signal whose frequency is controlled by a frequency control signal **(frequency synthesizer part 140 and 141 as disclosed in fig. 2 and further disclosed in col. 7 lines 6-10)**; a receive amplifier for amplifying and outputting a receive RF signal **(amplifier 122 as disclosed in fig. 2 and further disclosed in col. 7 lines 59-63)**; a receive mixer for mixing the receive RF signal amplified and the resonant frequency signal **(mixer 123 as disclosed in fig. 2 and further disclosed in col. 7 lines 59-63)**; a transmit mixer for mixing a transmit base band signal and the resonant frequency signal to convert the transmit base band signal into a transmit RF signal **(mixer 112 as disclosed in fig. 2 and further disclosed in col. 7 lines 3-6)**; and a transmit amplifier for amplifying and outputting the transmit RF signal **(amplifier 130 as disclosed in fig. 2 and further disclosed in col. 7 lines 3-6)**, wherein a resonant frequency of at least one of the receive amplifier, the receive mixer, the transmit mixer and the transmit amplifier is controlled by the frequency control signal **(frequency synthesizer part 140 and 141 generates a number of frequencies by their switching to effectively share frequency channels assigned to a system as**

**disclosed in fig. 2 and further disclosed in col. 7 lines 6-9).** However, Hongo et al. fail to disclose the receive mixer converts the receive RF signal into a receive base band signal.

Oono et al. disclose a direct conversion system for directly down-converting a received signal to a baseband signal (I/Q) as disclosed in col. 1 lines 39-53.

Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skills in the art at the time of invention to modify the mixer as disclosed by Hongo et al. to be able to direct convert the received signal to a baseband signal as disclosed by Oono et al. One is motivated as such in order to reduce the circuit size.

However, the combination fails to specifically disclose a frequency synthesizer providing a frequency control signal; such that frequency of the oscillator, receive amplifier, receive mixer, transmit mixer, transmit amplifier are controlled by the frequency control signal.

Kim et al. disclose a frequency synthesizer includes a PLL as disclosed in paragraph 47; and a control voltage from the phase locked loop (PLL) controls VCO, amplifier and mixer as disclosed in fig. 1A and 1B and abstract.

Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skills in the art at the time of invention to modify the PLL of Hongo et al. to be replaced with the PLL as disclosed by Kim et al., so the PLL can control the frequency of the oscillator, receive amplifier, receive mixer, transmit mixer, transmit amplifier. One

is motivated as such in order to reduce the number of required components in the multiband RF transceiver.

-Regarding claims 2, 4, 9 and 14, the combination further discloses the frequency control signal is provided from the base band processor **(Hongo et al., frequency synthesizer part 140 and 141 as disclosed in fig. 2 and further disclosed in col. 7 lines 6-10).**

-Regarding claims 5, 10, 15 and 17, the combination further discloses the frequency control signal includes an analog frequency control signal and a digital frequency control signal **(Hongo et al., as disclosed in fig. 2).**

-Regarding claims 6, 11, the combination further discloses the frequency of the resonant frequency signal is controlled by an analog frequency control signal and a digital frequency control signal, and wherein, a resonant frequency of the receive amplifier and the receive mixer is controlled by the frequency control signal **(Hongo et al., frequency synthesizer part 140 and 141 as disclosed in fig. 2 and further disclosed in col. 7 lines 6-10).**

-Regarding claims 7, 12 and 18, the combination further discloses the receive amplifier has a net input resistance controlled by the digital frequency control signal **(Oono et al., the second stage amplifier PGA2 and the third stage PGA3 are respectively configured so as to be capable of adjusting input offsets with resistors attached to their input terminals as disclosed in col. 9 lines 28-47).**



-Regarding claim 19, the combination of Hongo et al. and Oono et al. discloses all the limitation as claimed in claim 1. The combination further discloses a base band processor for inputting the receive base band signal and for outputting the transmit base band signal (**Oono et al., col. 1 lines 39-53**), wherein the oscillator, the receive amplifier and the receive mixer comprising an RF front-end receiver exhibiting an input impedance (**it is inherent for the oscillator, amplifier and mixer to have an input impedance**); the transmit mixer and the transmit amplifier comprising an RF front-end transmitter exhibiting and having an output impedance (**it is inherent for the amplifier and mixer to have an output impedance**); and the oscillator, the receive amplifier, the receive mixer, the transmit mixer and the transmit amplifier are controlled by the frequency control signal to substantially match an input impedance with an output impedance of the transceiver such that the transceiver transmits substantially a maximum power over a specific frequency band (**Impedance should be matched in designing the RF front-end transceiver in order to transmit maximum power as disclosed in applicant's admitted prior, paragraph 6 in the specification**).

7. Claim 16 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Hongo et al. (U.S. PATENT NO. 7,089,032) in view of Oono et al. (U.S. PATENT NO. 7,085,587), Kim et al. (U.S. PG-PUB NO. 2004/0048591) and further in view of Van Rumpt (U.S. PATENT NO. 7,299,018).

-Regarding claim 16, the combination of Hongo et al. and Oono et al. discloses all the limitation as claimed in claim 13. However, the combination fails to specifically disclose a LC tank including a capacitor controlled by the digital frequency control signal, a capacitor controlled by the analog frequency control signal and a fixed capacitor.

Van Rumpt discloses a LC tank including a capacitor controlled by the digital frequency control signal, a capacitor controlled by the analog frequency control signal and a fixed capacitor **(as disclosed in fig. 1B and further disclosed in col. 5 line 31-col. 6 line 38)**.

Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skills in the art at the time of invention to modify the oscillator as disclosed by Hongo et al. and Oono et al. to be the variable capacitance bank as disclosed by Van Rumpt. One is motivated as such in order to lower the bias voltage and to avoid the need for DC/DC converters.

8. Claim 20 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Hongo et al. (U.S. PATENT NO. 7,089,032) in view of Oono et al. (U.S. PATENT NO. 7,085,587), Kim et al. (U.S. PG-PUB NO. 2004/0048591) and further in view of Welland et al. (U.S. PG-PUB NO. 2003/0119467).

-Regarding claim 20, the combination of Hongo et al., Oono et al., and Kim et al. teaches all the limitations as claimed in claim 1. The combination further discloses the frequency synthesizer comprises a phase frequency detector for receiving a reference frequency  $f_{REF}$  **(Kim et al., phase detector**

**340, fig. 3); a low pass filter (Kim et al., loop filter 350 includes a low pass filter as disclosed in fig. 3 and paragraph 48); the oscillator operatively coupled to the LPF, wherein the oscillator providing the output resonant frequency,  $f_{LO}$  (Kim et al., VCO 360 as disclosed in fig. 3 and paragraphs 47-51); an N divider operatively coupled to the DAT-VCO and to the PFD (Kim et al., N divider 330 as disclosed in fig. 3).** However, the combination fails to specifically disclose a current pump operatively coupled to the phase frequency detector; a low pass filter operatively coupled to the current pump; a digital tuner in parallel to the low pass filter and operatively coupled to the current pump; and the oscillator operatively coupled to the LPF and to the DT, wherein the oscillator is a digital analog tuning voltage controlled oscillator for providing the output resonant frequency,  $f_{LO}$ .

Welland et al. disclose a current pump operatively coupled to the phase frequency detector **(CP 208 is coupled to PD 206 as disclosed in fig. 5); a low pass filter operatively coupled to the current pump (LF 210 is coupled to CP 208 as disclosed in fig. 5); a digital tuner in parallel to the low pass filter and operatively coupled to the current pump (discrete control 502 is in parallel with LF 210 and coupled to CP 208 as disclosed in fig. 5); the oscillator operatively coupled to the LPF and to the DT (VCO 400 is coupled to LF 210 and discrete control 502 as disclosed in fig. 5),** wherein the oscillator is a digital analog tuning voltage controlled oscillator for providing the output resonant frequency,

**$f_{Lo}$  (VCO 400 is a digital analog VCO as disclosed in fig. 5 and further disclosed in paragraph 56-60).**

Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skills in the art at the time of invention to modify the PLL of to be replaced with the PLL as disclosed by Welland et al. One is motivated as such in order to integrate the VCO with the other components of the PLL onto a single integrated circuit for size consideration.

### ***Response to Arguments***

9. Applicant's arguments with respect to claims 1-20 have been considered but are moot in view of the new ground(s) of rejection.

### ***Conclusion***

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to PING Y. HSIEH whose telephone number is (571)270-3011. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday-Thursday (alternate Fridays) 8:00am-5:00pm.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Nay A. Maung can be reached on 571-272-7882. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.

/P. Y. H./  
Examiner, Art Unit 2618

/Nay A. Maung/  
Supervisory Patent Examiner, Art  
Unit 2618